

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-29 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 10, 19, 23, and 27 are independent. Applicants amend claims 10, 19, 23, and 27, and the Specification herein. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised by this amendment. Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of all pending claims in view of the reasons set forth below.

I. Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objects to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the phrase “computer readable medium.” Applicants amend the specification to recite the phrase “computer readable medium,” which may contain the memory **18**. The Application as originally filed referenced a “computer readable medium” which may include RAM, ROM, or a hard disk drive (see, e.g., originally filed claims 19-22). Applicants submit herewith a Replacement Sheet replacing Figure 1, depicting these elements. Because these elements were present in the originally filed Application, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by this amendment.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejects claims 10-11 and 14-18, suggesting that “based on the Applicants’ Specification, said means could be merely software means” (Office Action at page 3). Applicants amend independent claim 10 to recite ***an output device for displaying the code generation report to a user.*** Claims 11 and 14-18 depend from claim 10. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment addresses the Examiner’s concerns regarding the subject matter of claims 10-11 and 14-18, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C §101 rejection of claims 10-11 and 14-18.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,114,149 to Aptus et al. (hereafter “Aptus”) in view of U. S. Patent No. 7,099,809 to Dori (hereafter “Dori”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A. Claims 1-3 and 5-9

Applicants’ independent claim 1 recites:

1. A method comprising:
generating source code from a block diagram model, the generating comprising:
including in the generated source code one or more comments that identify a reference to an element in the block diagram model;
generating a code generation report from the generated source code, the generating of the code generation report comprising:
parsing the one or more comments in the generated source code;
replacing the one or more comments with a hypertext link that refers to the element of the block diagram model identified by the comment; and
displaying the code generation report to a user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *generating source code from a block diagram model*, which is present in independent claim 1. The Examiner suggests that Aptus discloses this feature at column 5, lines 55-67 and column 17, lines 56-68. Applicants disagree since Aptus does not disclose a block diagram model. Column 5 of Aptus discloses source code that already exists; thus, it does not discuss *generating* source code at all. The source code is located in a “plurality of files” (Aptus at col. 17, line 59), and Aptus converts this preexisting source code into a “language neutral representation” (Aptus at col. 17, line 61-63). Column 17 of Aptus discusses an “improved software development tool” used to “develop source code in a project.” Applicants cannot find any reference to a *block diagram model* in Aptus.

Dori does not remedy the shortcomings of Aptus with respect to the above feature of claim 1. For example, Dori does disclose or suggest not *generating source code from a block diagram model*. In Dori, a user enters text into a script window (Dori at col. 3, lines 24-30). This text represents “Object Process Language (OPL)” Script, and it is this text, and not a *block*

diagram model, that Dori converts into C++ code (Dori at col. 15, lines 62-64). For at least these reasons, Aptus and Dori do not disclose or suggest *generating source code from a block diagram model*, as required by claim 1.

Aptus and Dori do not disclose or suggest still other features of claim 1. For example, Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *including in the generated source code one or more comments that identify a reference to an element in the block diagram model*, as further required by claim 1. Aptus is silent with respect to a block diagram model, and thus does not include comments in the generated source code *that identify a reference to an element in the block diagram model*. The Examiner suggests that Aptus discloses this feature of claim 1 at column 21, lines 65-67, at column 22, lines 1-13, and at column 23, lines 3-35, as well as in Figures 20, 24, and 25. Applicants disagree, because these passages of Aptus do not reference a block diagram model, and thus do not disclose or suggest *including in the generated source code one or more comments that identify a reference to an element in the block diagram model*.

Dori does not remedy the shortcomings of Aptus with respect to this feature of claim 1. While Dori discusses some automatic code generation, there is no discussion in Dori of *including in the generated source code one or more comments that identify a reference to an element in the block diagram model*. Therefore, Dori is silent as to this feature of claim 1.

Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest still other features of claim 1, such as *replacing the one or more comments with a hypertext link that refers to the element of the block diagram model identified by the comment*. The Examiner acknowledges that Aptus does not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1 (Office Action at page 5).

Further, combining Aptus and Dori does not result in *replacing the one or more comments with a hypertext link that refers to the element of the block diagram model identified by the comment*. The Examiner suggests that Dori discloses “maintaining an equivalence between a diagram model and a textual description for said diagram model, wherein the diagram model and textual description are linked in such a way that when a user selects a textual portion with a cursor, the corresponding element in the model is highlighted and

displayed” at column 3, lines 3-67, column 4, lines 1-4, and Figure 1, elements 102 and 104.

The Examiner suggests that this may be combined with the HTML hyperlinks in Aptus.

However, neither Aptus nor Dori discloses or suggests comments that identify a reference to an element in the block diagram model. Therefore, it would not be obvious to replace comments *with a hypertext link that refers to the element of the block diagram model identified by the comment*.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, does not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1. Claims 2-3 and 5-9 depend from claim 1 and therefore include each and every element of claim 1. Thus, Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 2-3 and 5-9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claims 10-12 and 14-18

Applicants’ independent claim 10 recites:

10. A system comprising:
means for generating source code from a block diagram model, the generated source code including at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model;
means for generating a code generation report from the generated source code, *the generating of the code generation report parsing the at least one comment in the generated source code and replacing the at least one comment with at least one hypertext link that refers to a corresponding element of the block diagram model;* and
an output device for displaying the code generation report to a user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *means for generating source code from a block diagram model*, which is present in claim 10. Aptus does not discuss a block diagram model at all, and thus could not generate source code from a block diagram model. Dori generates code from an OPL script, and not from a block diagram model.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *the generated source code including at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model*, which is present in claim 10. Because Aptus does not discuss a block diagram, Aptus does not include at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model in any source code. Dori does not associate comments with a block in the block diagram model, and so also does not *include at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model*.

Because neither Aptus nor Dori includes at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model, neither Aptus nor Dori discloses or suggests *the generating of the code generation report parsing the at least one comment in the generated source code and replacing the at least one comment with at least one hypertext link that refers to a corresponding element of the block diagram model*. Both Aptus and Dori are silent as to this feature of independent claim 10.

Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claim 10. Claims 11-12 and 14-18 depend from claim 10, and therefore include each and every element of claim 10. Thus, Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 11-12 and 14-18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 10-12 and 14-18.

C. Claims 19-22

Applicants' independent claim 19 recites:

19. A computer program product residing on a computer readable storage medium having instructions stored thereon which, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to:

generate source code from a block diagram model, the generated source code including at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model;

generate a code generation report from the generated source code, the generating of the code generation report parsing the at least one comment in the generated source code and replacing the at least one comment with at least one hypertext link that refers to a corresponding element of the block diagram model; and

display the code generation report to a user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *generating source code from a block diagram model*, which is present in claim 19. Aptus does not discuss a block diagram model at all, and thus could not generate source code from a block diagram model. Dori generates code from an OPL script, and not from a block diagram model.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *the generated source code including at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model*, which is present in claim 19. Because Aptus does not discuss a block diagram, Aptus does not include at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model in any source code. Dori does not associate comments with a block in the block diagram model, and so also does not *include at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model*.

Because neither Aptus nor Dori includes at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model, neither Aptus nor Dori discloses or suggests *the generating of the code generation report parsing the at least one comment in the generated source code and replacing the at least one comment with at least one hypertext link that refers to a corresponding element of the block diagram model*. Both Aptus and Dori are silent as to this feature of independent claim 19.

Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claim 19. Claims 20-22 depend from claim 19, and therefore include each and every element of claim 19. Thus, Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 20-22. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 19-22.

D. Claim 23-26

Applicants' independent claim 23 recites:

23. A computing system comprising:
a processor and
a memory,
wherein the processor and memory are configured to:
generate source code from a block diagram model, the generated source code including at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model;
generate a code generation report from the generated source code,
the generating of the code generation report parsing the at least one comment in the generated source code and replacing the at least one comment with at least one hypertext link that refers to a corresponding element of the block diagram model; and
display the code generation report to a user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest ***generating source code from a block diagram model***, which is present in claim 23. Aptus does not discuss a block diagram model at all, and thus could not generate source code from a block diagram model. Dori generates code from an OPL script, and not from a block diagram model.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest ***the generated source code including at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model***, which is present in claim 23. Because Aptus does not discuss a block diagram, Aptus does not include at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model in any source code. Dori does not associate comments with a block in the block diagram model, and so also does not ***include at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model***.

Because neither Aptus nor Dori includes at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model, neither Aptus nor Dori discloses or suggests ***the generating of the code generation report parsing the at least one comment in the generated source code and replacing the at least one comment with at least one hypertext link that refers to a corresponding element of the block diagram model***. Both Aptus and Dori are silent as to this feature of independent claim 23.

Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claim 23. Claims 24-26 depend from claim 23, and therefore include each and every element of claim 23. Thus, Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 24-26. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 23-26.

E. Claims 27-29

Applicants' independent claim 27 recites:

27. A method for generating a document having information about source code associated with a graphical model and providing a hyperlink referencing an element of the graphical model in the document, the method comprising the steps of:

providing source code identifying an element of the graphical model, *the source code including at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the graphical model*;

generating a document from the source code, *the generating of the document parsing the at least one comment in the generated source code and replacing the at least one comment with at least one hypertext link that refers to a corresponding element of the graphical model*; and

displaying the document to a user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *the source code including at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model*, which is present in claim 27. Because Aptus does not discuss a block diagram, Aptus does not include at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model in any source code. Dori does not associate comments with a block in the block diagram model, and so also does not *include at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model*.

Because neither Aptus nor Dori includes at least one comment listing a reference to a block in the block diagram model, neither Aptus nor Dori discloses or suggests *the generating of the document parsing the at least one comment in the generated source code and replacing the at least one comment with at least one hypertext link that refers to a corresponding*

element of the block diagram model. Both Aptus and Dori are silent as to this feature of independent claim 27.

Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claim 27. Claims 28-29 depend from claim 27, and therefore include each and every element of claim 27. Thus, Aptus and Dori, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 28-29. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 27-29.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner deems that issues persist, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicants' attorney.

Dated: August 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: / John S. Curran/
John S. Curran
Registration No.: 50,455
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicants